REMARKS

Applicants appreciate the thorough examination of the present application that is evidenced in the Final Official Action of October 20, 2005 (the "Official Action"). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the rejections set forth therein for the reasons provided below.

Independent Claims 1 and 33-35 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,175,917 to Arrow et al. ("Arrow"). Applicants respectfully submit that the interpretation of Arrow set forth in the Official Action is contrary to the express teaching of Arrow, and that Arrow does not anticipate Independent Claims 1 and 33-35.

Independent Claim 1 recites as follows:

> 1. A method of performing security processing in a computing network comprising a local unit having an operating system kernel executing at least one application program, comprising:
> receiving a first request at the operating system kernel from the application program to initiate a communication with a remote unit;
> providing a second request from the operating system kernel to a security offload component which performs security handshake processing, the second request directing the security offload component to secure the communication with the remote unit; and
> providing a control function in the operating system kernel for initiating operation of the security handshake processing by the security offload component.

Independent Claims 33-35 contain similar recitations. In the August 22, 2005 Amendment, the Applicants pointed out that Arrow discloses a virtual private network (VPN) in which VPN units perform security management functions for VPN clients over a shared network, and that the security processing is not controlled by the VPN client. Rather, as expressly stated by Arrow, the VPN units are controlled by a VPN management station 160 "through commands and configuration information transmitted to the respective VPN unit" through a public network. (Arrow, col. 6, ll. 31-34.) Arrow further states expressly that "secure data communications between end users are achieved in a way that is transparent to the end users." (Arrow, col. 7, ll. 5-7.)

In sharp contrast to the VPN security processing system of Arrow that is controlled by a remote VPN management station, Claim 1 recites "receiving a first request at the operating

system kernel from the application program to initiate a communication with a remote unit" and "providing a second request from the operating system kernel to a security offload component which performs security handshake processing, the second request directing the security offload component to secure the communication with the remote unit." Thus in a system according to Claim 1, security processing is <u>not</u> controlled by a remote VPN management station, but rather is initiated in response to a first request at the operating system kernel from the application program to initiate a communication with a remote unit, which is followed by a second request from the operating system kernel to a security offload component directing the security offload component to secure the communication with the remote unit.

The Official Action notes that VPN units may be implemented as software that "operates in conjunction with the communication software for connecting a remote client with its associated Internet Service Provider." Official Action at 13. The Official Action concludes that "therefore, for remote clients, VPN units 145, 155 ***are not*** controlled by the VAN (sic) management station 160." <u>Id.</u> (emphasis added).

Applicant respectfully submits that this understanding of Arrow is erroneous. The Official Action cites no passage from Arrow in support of this conclusion. In contrast, Arrow expressly states that the system disclosed therein includes "VPN units 115, 125, 135, 145 and 155 **<u>operating under the control of VPN management station 160</u>**." (Arrow, col. 5, ll. 51-53)(emphasis added). Thus, for purposes of controlling security processing, Arrow makes <u>no distinction</u> between VPN units that are implemented in software and those that are implemented as standalone hardware units. For example, Arrow further states that "[o]ne function of VPN management station 160 is to <u>manage the configuration of VPN units</u>, such as VPN unit 115, through issuance of configuration requests." (Arrow, col. 14, ll. 33-35.) Applicants can find no indication that the VPN management station of Arrow <u>does not</u> manage the configuration of VPN units that are implemented in software, as concluded in the Official Action.

Thus, the fact that some VPN units of Arrow may be implemented in software is immaterial to the patentability of Independent Claims 1 and 33-35. Regardless of how the VPN units are implemented, Arrow does not teach that security processing of the VPN units is initiated by a request sent, in response to request at the operating system kernel from an

application program to initiate a communication with a remote unit, from the operating system kernel to a security offload component which performs security handshake processing, as recited in Claim 1. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that Arrow does not anticipate Claim 1, and respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 be withdrawn.

Similar arguments may be made with respect to Independent Claims 33-35. For example, Claim 33 recites, inter alia, "receiving a request at the operating system kernel from the application program to initiate a communication with a remote unit; and directing the security offload component to secure the communication with the remote unit in response to the request." Claims 34 and 35 contain similar recitations. As explained above, Arrow does not teach or suggest these recitations. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 33-35 be withdrawn.

Applicants respectfully submit that the dependent claims are patentable at least as per the patentability of the claims from which they depend and/or at least for the reasons set forth in the Amendment dated August 22, 2005, which are incorporated herein by reference but which are not repeated herein for brevity.

CONCLUSION

In light of the above remarks, Applicants respectfully submit that the above-entitled application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested. If, in the opinion of the Examiner, a telephonic conference would expedite the examination of this matter, the Examiner is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (919) 854-1400.

Respectfully submitted,

David C. Hall
Registration No. 38,904

Customer Number 46589
Myers Bigel Sibley & Sajovec, P.A.
P.O. Box 37428
Raleigh, NC 27627
919-854-1400
919-854-1401 (Fax)